CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

CCD/PV.494
3 September 1970
ENGLISH

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FOUR HUNDRED AND NINETY-FOURTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 3 September 1970, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. M.A.A. KHATTABI (Morocco)

(Previous verbatim records in this series appeared under the symbols ENDC/PV.1-ENDC/PV.430).

GE.70-19362
70-35623

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Argentina:	Mr. C. ORTIZ de ROZAS
	Mr. A.F. DUMONT
	Mr. M.E. DELPECH
Brazil:	Mr. R.E. SARAIVA GUERREIRO
	Mr. D.F. NATARIO
	Mr. L.F. PALMEIRA LAMPREIA
Bulgaria:	Mr. T. PETROV
	Mr. I. PEINIRDJIEV
Burma:	U KYAW MIN
Canada:	Mr. G. IGNATIEFF
	Mr. R.W. CLARK
	Mr. R.E. MOORE
Czechoslovakia:	Mr. J. STRUCKA
	Mr. F. MARESKA
Ethiopia:	Mr. A. ZELLEKE
	Mr. G. DEMISSE
Hungary:	Mr. I. KOMIVES
	Mr. J. PETRAN
	Mr. F. GAJDA
India:	Mr. M.A. HUSAIN
	Mr. N. KRISHNAN
	Mr. K.P. JAIN
Italy:	Mr. R. CARACCIOLO
	Mr. F.L. OTTIERI
	Mr. R. BORSARELLI
	Mr. U. PESTALOZZA

Japan:	Mr. H. TANAKA
	Mr. H. OTSUKA
	Mr. J. SAKAMOTO
	Mr. A. TOMIKAWA
Mexico:	Mr. M. TELLO
Mongolia:	Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG
	Mr. Z. ERENDO
Morocco:	Mr. M.A.A. KHATTABI
Netherlands:	Mr. H.F. ESCHAUZIER
	Mr. E. BOS
Nigeria:	Mr. C.O. HOLLIST
	Mr. L.A. MALIKI
Pakistan:	Mr. K. AHMED
	Mr. S.A.D. BUKHARI
	Mr. T.O. HYDER
Poland:	Mr. W. NATORF
	Mr. K. ZYBYLSKI
	Mr. H. STEPOSZ
	Mr. R. WLAZLO
Romania:	Mr. I. DATCU
	Mr. N. CHILIE
Sweden:	Mr. A. EDELSTAM
	Mr. R. BOMAN

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:	Mr. A.A. ROSHCHIN
	Mr. I.I. TCHEPROV
	Mr. L.A. MASTERKOV
	Mr. Y.C. NAZARKINE
United Arab Republic:	Mr. H. KHALLAF
	Mr. O. SIRRY
	Mr. M. ISMAIL
United Kingdom:	Mr. I.F. PORTER
	Mr. W.N. HILLIER-FRY
	Mr. R. HOULISTON
United States of America:	Mr. J.F. LEONARD
	Mr. A.F. NEIDLE
	Mr. W. GIVAN
	Mr. R.L. McCORMACK
Yugoslavia:	Mr. M. BOZINOVIC
	Mr. M. VUKOVIC
Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General:	Mr. W. EPSTEIN

1. The CHAIRMAN (Morocco) (interpretation from French): I declare open the 494th plenary meeting of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

2. Mr. HUSAIN (India): The delegation of India welcomes the presentation by the delegations of the Soviet Union and the United States of the further revised version of their joint draft treaty on the sea-bed (CCD/269/Rev.3). In the discussions which took place in the Committee on the earlier version of the joint draft treaty (CCD/269/Rev.2), comments were made and suggestions were put forward by members of the Committee with a view to improving the draft treaty and thus making it more generally acceptable. In response to those comments and suggestions the two authors have made the changes in the text of their joint draft treaty on which they could reach agreement.

3. In the new version of the draft treaty the commitment of States parties to the treaty to continue negotiations concerning further measures for the prevention of an arms race on the sea-bed has been formulated in a separate article in the operative part of the draft treaty. The right to verify, which would be available to all States parties to the treaty, has been made more meaningful -- particularly in the case of developing countries, which may not possess the technological capability and necessary resources of their own to carry out verification. Also, States parties would have the possibility of undertaking verification through appropriate international procedures within the framework of the United Nations and in accordance with its Charter. Another change relates to the notification by a suspecting State party to all other States parties in regard to any doubts that might arise, and the reporting to them of the results of verification.

4. Furthermore, some linguistic changes have been made in order to bring about greater clarity in regard to the pre-eminence and special concerns of coastal States parties and to remove any doubts about the position of any State party in regard to questions in the domain of the law of the sea. That effort by the co-authors is commendable and is in keeping with both the letter and the spirit of the disclaimer clause contained in article IV of the draft treaty. Nothing should be done through a sea-bed treaty in the field of disarmament which would either prejudice or prejudge unsettled questions in regard to the law of the sea and international practice.

(Mr. Husain, India)

5. While all the changes and additions that have been made fall short in some respects of suggestions made by many delegations, including the Indian delegation, the minimum changes to make the draft treaty generally acceptable have been made; and it is the hope of my delegation that all members of this Committee will commend the delegations of the Soviet Union and the United States for their effort in that respect.

6. The delegation of India has been of the firm and consistent view that a sea-bed treaty in the field of disarmament should not in any way jeopardize the rights of coastal States on their continental shelves. On 17 April 1969, at the very beginning of the discussions in this Committee on the question of a sea-bed treaty and in the Indian delegation's first statement on that subject, we said:

> "As regards the definition of limits beyond which the prohibitions should apply, there would appear to be no disagreement that as large an area of the sea-bed as possible should be reserved for peaceful purposes. In that connexion the question of sovereignty in respect of territorial waters and sovereign rights in regard to the continental shelf and their importance from the defence and economic points of view would need to be taken carefully into consideration". (ENDC/PV.404, para. 68)

7. In subsequent statements the delegation of India has continued to stress the importance of safeguarding the rights of coastal States on their continental shelves. In its most recent statement on this subject, made on 25 June, the delegation of India said:

> "The Canadian proposal regarding the possibility of recourse to the good offices of the United Nations Secretary-General has been echoed by an overwhelming majority of coastal States which, being developing States, do not possess the technology and the resources to carry out verification by their own means with a view to ensuring that no activity would be carried out or any installation placed on the sea-bed near their coast which might endanger their security. In order that a sea-bed treaty may be widely acceptable, it is essential that this genuine and serious concern of the vast majority of coastal States in regard to their security should be satisfied. In our opinion, so far as continental shelves are concerned, other countries should not use them for military purposes". (CCD/PV.473, para. 64)

(Mr. Husain, India)

8. Our position is that, as a coastal State, India has and always has had full and exclusive sovereign rights over the continental shelf adjoining its territory and beyond its territorial waters and the subsoil thereof. It is in that sense that the delegation of India interprets the provision contained in paragraph 6 of article III of the joint draft treaty, which states that verification activities pursuant to the treaty shall be conducted, inter alia, with due regard for the rights of coastal States with respect to the exploration and exploitation of their continental shelves.

9. Mr. TANAKA (Japan): The delegation of Japan would like to congratulate the co-Chairmen on having submitted to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament their third revised draft treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof (CCD/269/Rev.3). We note that the co-Chairmen have taken into account many suggestions made by various delegations after the submission of the previous draft (CCD/269/Rev.2) in order to make the treaty more generally acceptable.

10. Although we do not pretend to regard the present text as perfect, we acknowledge that it represents the product of the intensive discussions and consultations among all the members of the Committee that have taken place since last year. We appreciate the co-Chairmen's efforts to reconcile various views, including our own, in drafting the present text. We consider it to be the best compromise attainable in the present circumstances.

11. The Japanese delegation is ready to join with other delegations in commending this draft treaty to the United Nations General Assembly for its favourable consideration. The United Nations has just embarked on the Disarmament Decade and is about to celebrate its twenty-fifth anniversary. We think that it is very fitting that we should have completed our work on this treaty in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament at the time of those important events.

12. Mr. EDELSTAM (Sweden): In two earlier statements to the Committee during the present session, on 25 June (CCD/PV.473) and 30 July (CCD/PV.483), my delegation commented on the draft treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the

(Mr. Edelstam, Sweden)

subsoil thereof (CCD/269/Rev.2) as presented to the Committee by the delegations of the Soviet Union and the United States on 23 April. In the first statement we suggested some amendments to and changes in the draft. On the latter occasion, speaking on behalf of nine non-aligned delegations, we formally presented a working paper (CCD/297) containing specific language for three concrete changes and additions to the text.

13. It is with particular satisfaction that my delegation takes note of the new draft of the treaty text (CCD/269/Rev.3) presented by the delegations of the Soviet Union and the United States on 1 September. That satisfaction stems from the fact that all three changes proposed in the above-mentioned working paper have been incorporated in the new text -- if not in identical language, at least without altering the purpose and meaning of the suggestions. We have also noted with satisfaction the further changes incorporated in article III.

14. The new text indeed represents -- to quote from the statement by the representative of the United States when introducing the new draft to the Committee on 1 September --

> "... a profound improvement in the treaty, making it both more effective and much more widely acceptable in the international community."
> (CCD/PV.492, para. 22)

We also agree with the statement made on the same occasion by the representative of the Soviet Union that --

> "This treaty will be an important step towards the exclusion of the sea-bed from the sphere of military activities, and will create favourable conditions for the adoption of other arms-control and disarmament measures." (ibid., para. 19)

15. In the last-mentioned context I am thinking also of the procedure which has been followed in negotiating this draft treaty in the Committee. Like other representatives who spoke before me, I wish to stress our satisfaction at the methods of work which the co-Chairmen have utilized, with detailed consultations and negotiations with all other members of the Committee as the process of seeking common language on outstanding points advanced. We hope strongly that similar procedures will be used in the future when we continue our work on further and perhaps more important items on our agenda.

(Mr. Edelstam, Sweden)

16. I should like to take this opportunity to comment on one point which was touched upon in our statement of 25 June, to which I referred at the outset of this speech. We maintained then (CCD/PV.473, paras. 53, 54) that an unclear situation existed in the treaty text as regards the right to verify within the sea-bed zone in cases where the territorial sea of the coastal State was less than twelve nautical miles. We suggested that an additional paragraph be inserted in article III saying that the right of verification in the sea-bed zone should accrue exclusively to the coastal State. That suggestion was not adopted by the co-Chairmen; but in a statement before the Committee on 7 July the representative of the Soviet Union, referring to our suggestion, said:

> "... we should like to point out that the existing wording of the draft treaty quite plainly excludes the possibility of any verification activity by States other than coastal States within the twelve-mile coastal zone." (CCD/PV.476, para. 71)

The representative of the Soviet Union stated further:

> "In our view, article I, paragraph 2, which reserves the right of coastal States to undertake activities prohibited by the treaty within the zone referred to, presupposes that it is those States, i.e. the coastal States, that are to exercise control functions there. That is how we understand the matter." (ibid., para. 72)

In view of that statement my delegation did not press the matter any further.

17. In conclusion, I wish to state that the Swedish delegation is prepared to recommend to its Government approval of the treaty text in its present form and its submission to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

18. Mr. TELLO (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Mexico wishes to express, albeit in general terms, its views on the revised text of the draft treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof (CCD/269/Rev.3) which was submitted for consideration by the Committee by its co-sponsors at our meeting on 1 September.

19. First of all I should like to record our satisfaction at seeing that the proposals we formulated together with eight other non-aligned delegations (CCD/297) have been embodied in the new text, thus undoubtedly giving satisfaction not only to the

(Mr. Tello, Mexico)

sponsoring countries but also to the large number of States which, at the last session of the General Assembly, indicated the desirability of their inclusion. We should like to express at once our gratitude to the representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union for the statements they made (CCD/PV.492, paras. 24 et seq.; paras. 3 et seq.) in clarification of various points in the draft which lent themselves to different interpretations.

20. I wish to mention, with the same frankness with which I have spoken of the aspects which we regard as positive, the main problem which for the moment prevents my delegation from supporting the text as we should have wished. I am referring to article I, paragraph 2, concerning which, as the representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union are aware, my country considers it indispensable that wording be found which faithfully reflects what its co-sponsors had in mind when they incorporated it in the draft. To fulfil that purpose my delegation does not particularly insist on any of the three forms of words which we ventured to suggest, if any of them is unacceptable. We would, however, hope that at the next session of the General Assembly an effort will be made to find a satisfactory solution, which will enable the draft, to which our Committee has devoted a large part of its time in the past two years, to receive unanimous — or at least the widest possible — support.

21. Lastly, we believe that a very special effort should also be made to incorporate in the treaty the essence of the categorical statements made by the co-Chairmen on Tuesday 1 September that the provisions of paragraph 3 of article I apply also to activities carried out in any part of the submarine area of the nuclear-free zones (CCD/PV.492, paras. 15, 35).

22. Mr. SARAIVA GUERREIRO (Brazil): Today I wish to present the views of the Government of Brazil on the third revision of the draft treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof (CCD/269/Rev.3).

23. It will be recalled that the Brazilian delegation has always taken an active interest and an active part in the negotiations for the completion of that treaty, both in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament itself and in the United Nations General Assembly. From the very inception of such negotiations we have had two overriding objectives: on the one hand, to achieve a meaningful result in preventing

(Mr. Sarpiva Guerreiro, Brazil)

the extension of the arms race to the sea-bed; and on the other hand to avoid needless prejudice to or prejudgement of parallel but distinct questions of the law of the seas that are the object of study and consideration in other forums.

24. The Brazilian delegation was among the first to say that the objective of attaining a meaningful result would still be achieved if the agreement on the non-armament of the sea-bed were to be more restricted in scope than was originally proposed. Such an international instrument can legitimately be called a further step on the long and winding road leading to disarmament.

25. The second objective assumed greater importance as the negotiations progressed beyond the issue of scope and revolved more and more around the procedures for control and verification. The various statements and working papers which were presented by Brazil (ENDC/264, CCD/267, CCD/PV.473) aimed at ensuring that, in the search for an early result, the legitimate interests of coastal States in particular would not in any way be harmed or left unprotected. Our voice has often been a critical one, and it was the considered opinion of my Government that it could not have been otherwise so long as a balanced and universally-acceptable treaty remained our fundamental goal.

26. I need not recapitulate in detail the points we have raised, as I am sure that all representatives here can remember them. In the light of the third revision that has just been presented by the delegations of the United States of America and the Soviet Union, I am under instructions from my Government to state that the draft treaty now meets the essential points of our position. We accept the draft as it stands, in an effort to demonstrate our willingness to appraise realistically the margins of compromise and our sincere attachment to the pursuit of valid results in the field of disarmament.

27. Naturally we do not find the text ideal — a feeling that, I would venture to guess, is prevalent in all quarters. There is no solution capable of fully and simultaneously satisfying each and every party to negotiations of this order. As often happens, what would be regarded by some as a further amelioration could appear to others as an undesirable deterioration. That is why we are convinced in our own minds that an acceptable point of equilibrium has now been reached. The cornerstone of that equilibrium is to be found, of course, in article IV, which was already included in the previous draft (CCD/269/Rev.2). That is a fundamental clause. It is in the light of its provisions that all norms contained in the draft are to be adequately understood and faithfully adhered to.

(Mr. Saraiva Guerreiro, Brasil)

28. One concrete example will illustrate that assertion. With regard to articles I and II it is now crystal clear that all words and phrases dealing with the delimitation of the area of application of the treaty apply solely to the purposes of the treaty and cannot therefore be regarded as having any additional meaning or value, no matter how indirect or marginal. Any attempts to arrive at different interpretations are inadmissible and devoid of any juridical value whatsoever. From the outset we have considered inappropriate the reference to the 1958 Geneva Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone[1/]. As it now stands, the reference has deservedly been reduced to the point of innocuity and is to be regarded as a purely pragmatical utilization of a text, for the sake of convenience, with a view to defining the baselines of the area of application of the treaty.

29. I now come to the article that has been at the top of the list of controversial matters, namely, article III. It is quite natural that such emphasis should have been laid on that point. Actually, it was in the context of verification that one could have expected that undesirable prejudgements might appear as by-products of a treaty which was designed to cover solely disarmament matters. Quite specifically it must be recognized that it is mainly in the framework of the control process and the modalities of its application that the overwhelming majority of potential parties to the treaty will eventually be called upon to play an active role, since the prohibition itself embodied in the treaty affects only a very limited number of States.

30. I should like to make a few points on the new version of article III.

31. First, I must say that we are very much in agreement with the adjustment that has been made in the last phrase of paragraph 1. We think it quite reasonable and correct to include in the new paragraph 6 what was previously in that last phrase. Although this draft treaty already includes a general disclaimer clause in article IV, it is certainly adequate and desirable to include another clause of the same nature in article III, covering in particular the questions of verification and control.

32. Still with regard to paragraph 1, the Brazilian delegation welcomes the retention of the phrase "provided that such observation does not interfere with such activities", inasmuch as it further clarifies the general understanding of the mechanism of verification.

1/ United Nations Treaty Series, vol.516, pp.205 et seq

(Mr. Saraiva Guerreiro, Brazil)

33. I now come to a point which, in our view, is of the highest importance. In fact the Government of Brazil wishes to place on record that in its understanding the word "observation", as it appears in paragraph 1, refers only to observation that is incidental to the normal course of navigation in accordance with international law. In this context I take due note that Mr. Leonard, in his statement on 1 September introducing the third revised edition of the draft treaty, said that —

> "In that connexion I want to emphasize again a point which has been fundamental to these negotiations: all the provisions of this treaty, including those relating to verification through observation as well as other verification activities, are designed to ensure that the treaty will accomplish its arms-limitation purposes; the provisions of the treaty are not intended to affect any of the various outstanding problems regarding the law of the sea. While the United States has taken this position from the very beginning and has felt that previous drafts were responsive to this need, we have continued to work with other delegations to find formulations which all could accept as being entirely neutral on these issues. We believe that article III as now drafted, together with the article IV disclaimer, which remains unchanged, should remove any remaining doubt as to the possibility that the treaty might affect law-of-the-sea issues." (CCD/PV.492, para. 24)

34. Paragraphs 2 and 3 now incorporate the essence of what has been for over a year now one of the main points that my delegation has advocated: namely a process of adequate notification and the corresponding right to participate in the consultations and further verification procedures that — as we have been maintaining — should accrue to the coastal State since it has direct and vital economic and security interests in certain areas that are covered by the treaty. The modifications introduced into the new text represent a major improvement in the sense that they clarify the issue and in fact establish a right of notification and of participation.

35. Paragraph 6, as I have said before, contains far clearer language than was included in the former paragraph 6, and does not prejudge the issues it covers, especially the extent of the rights of a coastal State over its continental shelf. On the other hand, considering that from the very beginning of the debate on the sea-bed treaty we have given our general support to the ideas reflected in document CCD/297, presented by nine members of the group of twelve, we have appreciated the efforts made to meet those ideas.

(Mr. Saraiva Guerreiro, Brazil)

36. As I reach the concluding part of these comments on the sea-bed treaty, let me again say that we have achieved an acceptable compromise solution. We would therefore find it possible to join in an expression of commendation of the draft to the General Assembly if that were the inclination of the Conference in approving its report on this year's session.

37. May I take this opportunity to make some very brief remarks on two subjects with which this Committee has been dealing this year: namely the problem of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons, and the question of a comprehensive programme of disarmament?

38. I wish to place on record the satisfaction which my delegation felt when it became possible for the group of twelve to submit a memorandum on the question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons (CCD/310). We think that that memorandum is significant and appropriate at the present stage of the discussion of this matter. It was presented to the Committee by the Yugoslav representative in a very factual and precise statement (CCD/PV.490), with which we are in agreement. He called attention to the three main points contained in the memorandum: first, that chemical and biological weapons constitute a priority item in our programme of work; second, that we shall continue to deal with and negotiate on that item as a single field during the next year or so; and third, that adequate controls are a matter of importance.

39. One point that was not made at that time — indeed, there was no need to make it, because it appears clearly from an analysis of the document — was that the text carefully avoids prejudging the results of our endeavours in this field of chemical and biological weapons. I think that for the sake of clarity I should place on the record this understanding of my delegation — and in fact of the entire group of twelve — that we had no intention of prejudging the results of our work. We thought that there was no need to go into that at this stage. Of course, individual delegations — including some in the group of twelve -- already have definite opinions about the eventual results of these negotiations and discussions on chemical and biological weapons. However, we thought we could find a common denominator by avoiding mention of those eventual results, and that at this stage we did not need to go into that.

(Mr. Saraiva Guerreiro, Brazil)

40. The other matter that I want to mention — I have not previously had an opportunity to do so — is the draft comprehensive programme of disarmament which was presented to this Committee by the delegations of Mexico, Sweden and Yugoslavia (CCD/313). My Government has already had an opportunity of making a preliminary analysis of that document. We welcome the efforts made by the delegations that prepared it. Our first impression is that it is a very useful and worthwhile basis for further work during the forthcoming General Assembly session. We hope to co-operate at that time with the delegations that co-sponsored the document and with other interested delegations in an effort to work out a draft that will be able to obtain the very broad, if not unanimous, support of the General Assembly.

41. Mr. PORTER (United Kingdom): I have listened with interest to the various statements made during the past three days in the third revision of the draft sea-bed treaty (CCD/269/Rev.3). We in this delegation would like to thank the co-Chairmen for all the work they have put into this revised draft. They have clearly made a serious effort to meet the concerns of other delegations. Naturally, not every suggestion, including some which this delegation put forward earlier, has been included; but the text now before us is in our view balanced and acceptable. We in this Committee can, I think, congratulate ourselves on the outcome of our long deliberations.

42. As for particular points, we are glad to see that the United States and Soviet delegations have been able to meet the widespread wish for a reference to international procedures in article III, dealing with verification. At our meeting on 28 July Lord Lothian said that, if an appropriate and widely-acceptable formulation could be found, the United Kingdom Government would welcome it (CCD/PV.482, para.12).

43. The remaining amendments to article III largely concern law-of-the-sea questions; and it is our impression that the careful language now incorporated by the co-Chairmen meets the difficulties of a number of delegations while at the same time not prejudging the outcome of any future discussions there may be on this matter.

44. With regard to the new article V, giving a commitment to undertake to continue negotiations in good faith concerning further measures in the field of disarmament for the prevention of an arms race on the sea-bed, my delegation recognizes the fact that the new text represents a big step forward to meet the wishes of many delegations.

(Mr. Porter, United Kingdom)

45. This is the third revision of the co-Chairmen's joint draft treaty, and we can now expect to bring two years' work on the subject to a successful conclusion. We look forward to seeing the treaty opened for signature soon after the forthcoming session of the General Assembly.

46. While I have the floor, may I say a few words of a more personal nature? This is Ambassador Husain's last day with us in this Committee. In a month's time he will be taking up a key post in the Commonwealth Secretariat in London. Ambassador Husain has brought to our work skills and talent of the highest order, and I have always appreciated the lucidity of his statements. He will certainly be remembered as one of the ablest representatives our Committee has had. I shall miss Azim Husain both as a friend and as a colleague. I have no doubt about the success with which he will carry out his new duties, and it therefore remains for me only to wish him a very happy time in London.

47. Mr. BOZINOVIC (Yugoslavia): On 1 September the delegations of the Soviet Union and the United States introduced a new revised draft treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof (CCD/269/Rev.3). The representatives of the Soviet Union and the United States clearly explained the changes contained therein (CCD/PV.492). At this stage my delegation would like, first of all, to express its appreciation to the delegations of the Soviet Union and the United States for this new revision of their draft treaty, incorporating further changes in order to meet various views expressed and requests made by a number of delegations.

48. I should like to say also how much we value the contribution of other delegations in the effort to achieve a treaty that would be as widely acceptable as possible. My delegation has also endeavoured, in its modest way, to contribute in a concrete manner by suggesting changes which proved to be widely acceptable (CCD/PV.490). I should like more particularly to stress, in connexion with the preparation of the sea-bed treaty, the spirit of collaboration that has been widely noted in this Committee and has already been referred to by several delegations.

49. On this occasion my delegation would like again to point to the limited scope of this treaty and to stress our interest in seeing a comprehensive demilitarization of the sea-bed. That is in fact our understanding of the meaning of the new article V of the draft treaty.

(Mr. Bozinovic, Yugoslavia)

50. Bearing all that in mind, the Yugoslav delegation is prepared to recommend to its Government support for this treaty, in the belief that it will represent a step forward — a step in the right direction which would contribute to progress in more substantive measures of disarmament.

51. Mr. ZELLEKE (Ethiopia): I should first like to join other delegations that have welcomed the new revised draft treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof (CCD/269/Rev.3), submitted jointly by the Soviet Union and the United States delegations on 1 September.

52. It will be recalled that, when the question of disarmament measures for the sea-bed was first raised, my delegation was among those that preferred a comprehensive prohibition of all military activities in the sea-bed. It has not been possible, however, to achieve that in present circumstances. We nevertheless take satisfaction in the fact that the co-Chairmen have finally found it possible to include in the draft treaty a new article, article V, which entails a definite commitment to continue negotiations in good faith concerning further measures for the prevention of an arms race on the sea-bed.

53. The changes introduced in the new revised draft are many and substantial. My delegation is happy to note that among the last changes or amendments introduced in the new text the co-Chairmen found it possible to include all the suggestions contained in the working paper of the nine delegations (CCD/297), including that of an appropriate international procedure for verification within the framework of the United Nations, as it now appears in article III, paragraph 5.

54. We know that this has not been an easy task for the co-Chairmen. Therefore we congratulate them on the spirit of co-operation and willingness to accommodate the views of other delegations which they have shown throughout the process of negotiations on the draft treaty now before us.

55. My delegation has already transmitted the text of the draft to its Government for favourable consideration, and for final approval at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

56. Mr. ORTIZ de ROZAS (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of Bulgaria, Mr. Petrov, said among other things in his statement on 27 August, referring to chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons:

> "It is gratifying that the majority of the members of the Committee consider, however, that a complete and joint prohibition of chemical and bacteriological weapons is necessary. May I mention, first of all, Sweden, Yugoslavia, Morocco, the United Arab Republic, India -- in fact, the whole of the group of non-aligned countries as well as the socialist countries?" (CCD/PV.491, para. 88)

Later, in referring to the working paper (CCD/295) submitted by you, Mr. Chairman, as representative of Morocco, the representative of Bulgaria emphasized the following paragraph:

> "'The development, production and stockpiling of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons should be jointly prohibited by the terms of one principal legal instrument which would also make provision for the destruction of such weapons.'" (CCD/PV.491, para. 88)

He added that this was also the sense of -

> "... paragraph 6 of the joint memorandum presented by the twelve non-aligned countries (CCD/310). That document expresses clearly and concisely the opinion of the twelve countries on this problem." (ibid.)

57. At yesterday's meeting the representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Roshchin, also referred several times (CCD/PV.493) to that same memorandum (CCD/310), of which the Argentine delegation is one of the authors.

58. Of course, we cannot speak for the other delegations which participated in its preparation and which appear in the list of sponsors; but as far as our own delegation is concerned we wish to make it perfectly clear, in order that there may be no doubts as to our position, that in sponsoring that memorandum Argentina did not have -- nor does it have now -- any intention of pronouncing itself in favour of either of the conflicting theses on this question -- that is to say, the thesis propounded by the United Kingdom on the one hand and that of the socialist countries on the other.

59. In his excellent introduction of the memorandum the representative of Yugoslavia, Mr. Bozinovic, pointed out with precision and objectivity that the group of co-sponsors wished to stress three main aspects: first, the importance and urgency of the solution

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

of the problem of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons; second, the necessity for questions relating to such weapons to continue to be dealt with jointly; and, third, the importance of the solution of the verification problem (CCD/PV.490, paras. 63-65).

60. There is nothing in the memorandum, and nothing was said when it was introduced, which would allow anyone to assume that its authors were thus supporting or even favouring the trends of thought which seek the prohibition of such weapons in a single instrument or in separate instruments. We must be quite clear on that point. To deal with a problem -- I repeat, to deal with a problem -- jointly does not imply or involve the idea of a joint solution in a single instrument. Nor does it imply rejecting that possibility, or any other possibility that exists or may emerge. The text says unequivocally that the problem must continue to be dealt with, and I emphasize the word "continue", because it means no more than that — in other words, that we must continue doing what we have been doing so far.

61. We felt it necessary to put this position on record in order to place matters in their right perspective and because, to be perfectly truthful, we are somewhat surprised at the manner in which the memorandum is being interpreted. We have no doubt that the question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons still demands a process of very difficult negotiation. It is not our intention or our policy to disrupt that process, which is in full development. To do so would be to run the risk of hampering dialogue and understanding, thus making more difficult the road we still have to tread before we can devise satisfactory formulas.

62. The experience acquired in connexion with the draft treaty on the denuclearization of the sea-bed and the ocean floor (CCD/269/Rev.3) has been very illuminating in this respect. Agreements are not achieved through the sum of individual positions but rather through a process of real negotiations in which each and every view is examined according to its merits. That is the approach and that is the spirit which we believe should prevail in the case of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons.

63. Mr. KHALLAF (United Arab Republic): My delegation had the opportunity at our meeting on 1 September of welcoming (CCD/PV.492, para. 67) the submission by the United States and the Soviet Union of their third revised draft of the sea-bed treaty (CCD/269/Rev.3). The draft as it now stands takes into account a number — though not all — of the important suggestions submitted by my delegation individually and by the members of the group of twelve collectively.

(Mr. Khallaf, United Arab Republic)

64. I should like to refer in particular to the proposals dealing with further disarmament measures on the sea-bed, with international procedures for verification and with procedures for notification, which my delegation along with others submitted to the Conference. We are grateful to the co-authors for including them in the new text. We appreciate also the statements made by the co-authors to the effect that the provisions of paragraph 2 of article III, concerning consultation and co-operation on procedures of verification, are not an obligatory precondition for the use by the parties of the right to refer the matter directly to the Security Council.

65. Time and again one of the basic principles on which the treaty rests has been stressed: that the provisions of the treaty do not, in any circumstances whatsoever, go beyond the precise purpose of arms limitation. Thus the treaty is not meant, nor does it seek, to settle or even influence issues pertaining to international law. Furthermore -- and this is of no less importance -- the treaty is not to be used as a means of serving certain political ends which are alien to its objectives.

66. I should like to conclude by paying a tribute to the two authors for their constructive attitude -- indeed, their keen intent that the treaty should be the product of the combined efforts of one and all. That has been accomplished with success; and it is with confidence that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament can now look forward to the consideration and approval of the treaty by the General Assembly.

67. I should like to join Ambassador Porter in bidding farewell to Ambassador Husain. Ambassador Husain has, as we all know, played an outstanding part in our endeavours. My delegation in particular has always appreciated the devotion, drive and perspicacity he has placed at the service of disarmament. I should like to assure him that we shall always remember him and wish him well in his new and important post.

68. Mr. HOLLIST (Nigeria): The delegation of Nigeria joins previous speakers in thanking the co-Chairmen for submitting the third revised version of the draft sea-bed treaty (CCD/269/Rev.3). We very much appreciate the efforts of the authors of the draft treaty to accommodate as far as possible the views and suggestions expressed in the course of the discussions in the Committee on the previous drafts. In that connexion we are pleased that the amendments sponsored by Nigeria and eight other delegations (CCD/297) have been incorporated in the revised text. The new text is by no means perfect, but it certainly constitutes an appreciable improvement on the previous drafts and we believe that it should be widely acceptable.

(Mr. Hollist, Nigeria)

69. The delegation of Nigeria welcomes the revised draft and is recommending it to its Government. We sincerely hope that the draft treaty will ultimately receive the approval of the United Nations General Assembly, and that this Committee will pursue in good faith further negotiations on the demilitarization of the sea-bed.

70. U KYAW MIN (Burma): The negotiations in the Committee on a treaty to prevent a nuclear arms race on the sea-bed have now been concluded with the presentation on 1 September, by the delegations of the Soviet Union and the United States of America, of the fourth version of the joint draft treaty (CCD/269/Rev.3). Those negotiations have been long and difficult, but what has been achieved as a result leaves no question that the time and energy so spent have indeed been worth while. That becomes evident at once when one compares the latest draft with the first joint draft of 7 October 1969 (CCD/269). My delegation welcomes the new draft and the many important changes introduced in it, even though some of them fall somewhat short of what my delegation would have preferred. In particular we welcome the inclusion of a provision in an operative paragraph of the treaty relating to international verification, and another relating to continued negotiations to prevent an arms race in the environment of the sea-bed.

71. I should like to take this opportunity to express sincere appreciation to the co-Chairmen for the good will and spirit of co-operation they have shown during these negotiations — which, it would be fair to say, were reciprocated in full measure by the other members of the Committee —, and the democratic way in which they sought, considered and responded to the views and suggestions of other delegations. The resultant draft treaty now before the Committee can therefore be fairly described as the product of truly multi-party negotiations involving the entire membership of the Committee, negotiations which have been marked by a willingness on the part of all concerned to understand and appreciate each other's views and concerns. To my mind, such negotiations are indispensable if our Committee is to succeed in working out viable and generally-acceptable agreements in the field of disarmament which take due account of the needs and interests of all countries, including those of the smaller, non-armed Powers. I can therefore agree whole-heartedly with Mr. Leonard, who on 1 September said that the "Committee itself has been substantially strengthened" (CCD/PV.492, para. 22) in the process of negotiating this treaty.

(U Kyaw Min, Burma)

72. In the view of my delegation the draft, as now revised, despite its inevitable imperfections in certain respects, succeeds in meeting the requirements of an effective arms-control measure without prejudicing the rights and interests of coastal States; and as a result it possesses the minimum necessary elements of a viable and balanced arms-control agreement for the sea-bed. I shall not fail to emphasize that point when submitting the draft, with my views, to my Government for its final consideration.

73. In conclusion, my delegation would venture to hope that whatever work may have been done or planned to develop sea-bed nuclear-weapon systems — which, we have been assured, include the so-called crawlers — will be abandoned and that the bottom of the seas and oceans of the world will remain effectively denuclearized, not only in the area where the prohibitions of the treaty apply but from coast to coast.

74. While I have the floor, I should like to join Ambassador Porter and Ambassador Khallaf in bidding farewell to Ambassador Husain of India. I associate myself whole-heartedly with what they have said about the abilities of Ambassador Husain and the great contributions which he has made to the work of this Committee, and join in wishing him health, happiness and success in his new important post.

75. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): We are approaching the end of our discussions in this Committee on matters of substance. There seems to be only one question left to be dealt with, that of the report to the General Assembly. Our delegation would therefore like to make a few general comments in connexion with the conclusion of the Committee's summer session.

76. At the end of the Committee's spring session in April we observed that this summer session would impose special responsibilities on the Committee, not only because we should have to finish our work on some of the problems under consideration, but also because the session would be taking place on the eve of the twenty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly (CCD/PV.469, para. 64). It may be noted that the Committee is completing its work this year in circumstances marked by certain positive advances in the international situation. In a number of regions where a tense atmosphere has always existed we perceive possibilities of a change for the better. This is true of Europe, where the idea of the need for new specific measures to ensure European security is gaining strength. It also applies to some other regions of the world.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

77. We are gratified that this Committee too, as a result of the work of its summer session, has been able to make a positive contribution to the cause of disarmament and international security. We have in mind first of all the draft treaty it has prepared on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof (CCD/269/Rev.3). The discussion on such major problems as the elimination of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons from the life of mankind, and general and complete disarmament, has also been useful. Those are the problems on which attention has been focussed during the present session, and therefore we think it necessary to review our detailed discussion of them.

78. As many delegations have pointed out, the discussion of the draft treaty on the sea-bed and ocean floor was marked by an effort to reach agreement and resolve controversial matters in a spirit of search for mutually-acceptable compromises, and by a desire to give careful consideration to the suggestions and proposals that had been made. As a result, we managed to make a start on the demilitarization of an important environment whose conquest by man is, we believe, accelerating. The successful completion of the work on this draft treaty shows that it is really possible for us to find mutually-acceptable solutions to complex problems in the matter of stopping the arms race and achieving disarmament. The Soviet Union hopes that, by the joint efforts of the members of this Committee and other members of the General Assembly, the draft treaty will be supported and approved at the forthcoming session of the General Assembly, that it will not be long before the treaty is opened for signature and that a large number of States will become parties to it. In that event a new important norm of international law will be enshrined in the form of a treaty, which will serve as a point of departure for the additional steps that must be taken for the further demilitarization of the sea-bed and the ocean floor.

79. An important contribution to the work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament has been the discussion of the problem of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons. We should like to note first of all that the Committee has recently moved more and more from a general consideration of this problem to examination of the specific substance of measures to prohibit the production and stockpiling of chemical and bacteriological weapons. A most promising development has been that more and more countries — and this has clearly become the prevailing view

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

in the Committee -- are taking as their premise the need for simultaneous prohibition of both chemical and bacteriological means of warfare. The Soviet delegation has already had occasion to draw attention (CCD/PV.493, paras. 3, 24, 25) to the memorandum submitted by the non-aligned countries members of the Committee (CCD/310). We believe that we are justified in saying that both in the Committee and outside it there is a growing general desire to see efforts to solve the problem of chemical and bacteriological weapons intensified.

80. One of the results of the discussion has been a better mutual understanding of the positions of States and of the substance of proposals concerning chemical and bacteriological weapons. In that connexion, however, it must be noted that serious difficulties have appeared on the way to a mutually-acceptable solution, because some Western Powers are not prepared at this time to seek a simultaneous solution to the problem of prohibiting both chemical and bacteriological weapons. But we believe that the final result of this summer session has been to increase our hopes and to give us better reason to think that in the future the Committee will be able to take positive steps for prohibiting chemical and bacteriological weapons on the basis that enjoys wide support in many countries of the world.

81. The discussion of the problem of general and complete disarmament has also been of great importance. Let me recall that at the beginning of the spring session the Soviet delegation called for renewed active consideration of that problem by the Committee (CCD/PV.449, paras. 55-59). We are gratified to note that many other delegations have also spoken in favour of reviving the discussion of general and complete disarmament, and have put forward many suggestions on this question, which merits careful study. Indeed, it must be recognized that this problem is one of the most important tasks of the present time and that agreement on it would be a guarantee of peace and security for all peoples.

82. The very fact of this marked revival of the Committee's work on the problem of general and complete disarmament has positive significance. It corrects in the right direction the correlation of efforts both to solve the problem and to agree on some partial measures of disarmament. In our view there is no denying that success in any of those efforts will have a positive effect on the entire course of disarmament negotiations and on the possibilities of achieving progress during those negotiations. We must not forget, however, that final agreement on general and complete disarmament can only be reached if all the militarily-significant States, and first and foremost all the nuclear Powers, take part in the negotiations.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

83. During this session considerable attention has also been given to a number of other disarmament problems, on some of which we should like to express our views. One is the question of a comprehensive nuclear test ban -- in other words, essentially, the prohibition of underground tests.

84. The Soviet Union has always advocated the reaching of agreement on prohibition of the underground testing of nuclear weapons. Members of the Committee are well aware of our position that such a prohibition could be achieved on the basis of the use of national means of detection for verifying the fulfilment by the parties of their obligations. What is required for a positive solution of the problem of banning all nuclear tests is first of all the adoption of the necessary political decisions. In that connexion one must needs be wary of certain attempts to direct the Committee's work towards various types of technical investigations and research about the problem of a nuclear test ban and not towards a solution of the problem. The Soviet delegation has more than once expressed its readiness for some constructive compromise proposals in the interests of early agreement on an underground nuclear test ban. But we should not like anyone to interpret our position as meaning that we shall agree to being diverted from the substance of the problem into the field of fruitless technical investigations designed only to delay as long as possible the cessation of underground nuclear tests.

85. Among other measures discussed at the present session of the Committee was the question of the use of radiological means and lasers for military purposes. Various opinions have been expressed in the Committee on the state of their technology and practical applicability, and seem to us reasonable from the point of view of the present development of science and technology. But we should like to point out that, before a decision is taken on whether the Committee should regard the question of these means as finally settled, it should await further scientific and technical progress, since we may encounter some unforeseen developments in this field.

86. In our opinion, the work done by the Committee at this session and indeed since the beginning of the year provides a constructive basis for a thorough consideration of the problem of disarmament at the twenty-fifth anniversary session of the United Nations General Assembly. We are convinced that that jubilee session will devote all the necessary attention to these problems, and that during the discussion in the General Assembly considerations will be advanced which in their turn can be examined in this Committee. The Soviet delegation hopes that in the Committee's future work tangible and concrete results will be obtained in the solution of the problems before it.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

87. In conclusion, we should like to wish the members of the Committee success in the search for mutually-acceptable solutions in the field of disarmament measures, since this would meet the aspirations of all peoples and lead to the strengthening of peace and security. We should also like to express our satisfaction and gratitude to the Secretariat, to the Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General and his colleagues for their good organization and support of the Committee's activities.

88. Since I have the floor, I should like to associate our delegation with the words of farewell and good wishes addressed to Ambassador Husain, who is leaving his post as representative of India in the Committee on Disarmament. We express to him our warm sympathy and our regret that we are losing a colleague of such distinction, who has always exercised a great constructive influence in the creation of the favourable atmosphere in which our negotiations have proceeded. Whenever our points of view did not coincide on the problems examined in the Committee, Ambassador Husain invariably presented his with the utmost clarity, while showing full understanding for the position of the other side. We wish Ambassador Husain the best of good fortune in his new work, and ask him to convey our warm regards to Mrs. Husain.

89. The CHAIRMAN (Morocco) (interpretation from French): As Chairman of this meeting I am sure that I interpret the feelings of all the members of the Committee in expressing our most sincere feelings of friendship to Ambassador Husain, the head of the delegation of India, who will be leaving us for other important duties. Ambassador Husain has always distinguished himself by his competence and his excellent qualities as a man and as a diplomat, and by his ability he has contributed actively and effectively to the work of the Committee. We wish him all the success he deserves in his new post.

90. Mr. HUSAIN (India): I should like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and my other colleagues for what has been said about me personally and my impending departure from the membership of this Committee and the leadership of the Indian delegation. I deeply appreciate the kind words about my work in this Committee during the past three years. I should like to add that, while I am going to a wider and more varied sphere of duties and work, I shall greatly miss the interesting work in this Committee and the friendship and regard which my colleagues have always shown me and which I have enjoyed so much.

(Mr. Husain, India)

91. My association with this Committee has been for me a very valuable and memorable experience which I shall always cherish. This Committee is unique in that it is indispensable if the international community is to rid itself of the horrors of war and the cost of the preparation for such war. In this year 1970 the Committee has concluded its work on the sea-bed treaty (CCD/269/Rev.3), which is a solid and notable achievement -- much more than we were able to achieve last year. I have no doubt that in the years to come the Committee will continue to persevere in its difficult task and will reach agreement on even more important measures, particularly in the field of nuclear disarmament. I shall continue to take an interest, though from a distance, in the work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, not only because five members of the Commonwealth are represented here but also because the deliberations in this Committee are of vital concern to the entire Commonwealth of twenty-nine countries, and indeed to the world community as a whole.

92. I conclude by thanking warmly once again all my colleagues for the co-operation, the courtesy and the consideration which they have always shown me during my membership of this Committee, and I wish them every success in their endeavours in the future.

93. The CHAIRMAN (Morocco) (interpretation from French): I should now like to tell the members of the Committee that the co-Chairmen have informed me that the new draft report (CCD/316) will be distributed in English between 12.30 p.m. and 1 p.m. and in the other working languages in the early hours of the afternoon.

94. The co-Chairmen propose that this meeting should be suspended now and resumed this afternoon at 4 o'clock. If there are no objections, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 12.30 p.m. and resumed at 4.25 p.m.

95. Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) (translation from Russian): My delegation would like to associate itself with other members of the Committee in congratulating the co-sponsors of document CCD/269/Rev.3, the representatives of the USSR and the United States of America, upon their submission on 1 September of the new revised draft treaty prohibiting the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof. At the meeting of 23 July my delegation stressed the great importance of the document and clearly defined the position of my Government on this question (CCD/PV.481, paras. 37 et seq.). We stated that a solution of the problem of the demilitarization of the

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

sea-bed would be of benefit to all States without exception, and that prohibition of the use of the sea-bed and the ocean floor for military purposes would be an important step towards general and complete disarmament and would contribute to the lessening of international tension and the strengthening of confidence among States.

96. Today we re-assert our conviction that the draft treaty's basic provisions concerning the obligations of States parties not to emplace nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof will fully constitute one of the most important norms of international law. In its statement at the same meeting, my delegation pointed out to the members of the Committee that the noble idea of prohibiting the use of the sea-bed for military purposes was from the very beginning based on the all-embracing nature of that environment, and that the complete demilitarization of this largest of the world's regions would be wholly in our common interests of promoting the progress of mankind.

97. In that connexion I should like to say that our delegation warmly welcomes the co-sponsors' inclusion in the draft treaty of the new article V, which sets forth the undertaking of the parties to continue negotiations in good faith concerning further measures in the field of disarmament for the prevention of an arms race on the sea-bed, the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof.

98. In conclusion, let me say again that we welcome the efforts made by the co-sponsors and the members of the Committee, whose collective contribution has enabled us to work out the draft treaty on the sea-bed and the ocean floor in the form in which it is now before the Committee. My delegation expresses the hope that this important document will receive wide support and approbation at the forthcoming twenty-fifth anniversary session of the General Assembly, and be adopted and opened for signature and accession by the Governments of the States of all continents.

99. Mr. LEONARD (United States of America): I should like to speak briefly at this formal part of the meeting on two points.

100. First, I wish to join the other representatives who this morning expressed their very high esteem for Ambassador Husain and their regret that he is leaving us. We offer him our very best wishes for his continued success in the important post to which he is going.

(Mr. Leonard, United States of America)

101. Secondly, I wish to propose that this formal part of the meeting now be suspended and that we have an informal meeting to discuss the report of the Committee. After the conclusion of the informal discussion we might, I suggest, resume our formal meeting for the purpose of adopting the report.

102. The CHAIRMAN (Morocco) (interpretation from French): I believe that the members of the Committee agree that the formal meeting should be suspended and that the discussion should continue in an informal meeting. If I hear no objection, we shall proceed in that way.

It was so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 4.30 p.m. and resumed at 6.20 p.m.

103. The CHAIRMAN (Morocco) (interpretation from French): After the discussion in the informal meeting of the draft report (CCD/316) and the modifications made thereto, I assume that the members of the Committee can now consider the adoption of the report.

104. Mr. TELLO (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I shall be very brief. I should like, first of all, to express my thanks to the representative of the United States for the explanation he was kind enough to give me concerning the scope of the sentence which appears on page 13 of the English version of the draft report — the paragraph dealing with the statements made by the representatives of the Soviet Union and the United States when introducing the draft treaty (CCD/269/Rev.3).

105. Next I should like to express my thanks to the co-Chairmen for accepting the amendment proposed by Sweden and supported by my delegation and that of Yugoslavia, deleting the last sentence on page 17 of the draft report.

106. Lastly, the delegation of Mexico wishes to record its view on the paragraph which appears on page 18 of the draft report and reads as follows:

"Since the questions related to general and complete disarmament are matters of great importance and complexity and in view of the fact that in the course of its discussions a number of concrete considerations and proposals were put forward which merit broad and thorough study by governments and further discussion in the Committee, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament intends to continue its discussions of general and complete disarmament during 1971."

(Mr. Tello, Mexico)

We understand that that paragraph can in no way prejudge the attitude which the General Assembly may adopt in connexion with the consideration at the twenty-fifth session of the comprehensive programme of disarmament to which resolution 2602 E (XXIV) (CCD/275) refers.

107. The CHAIRMAN (Morocco) (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Mexico for the clarification he has made.

108. If there are no further comments on the report, I shall consider it adopted.

It was so decided.

109. The CHAIRMAN (Morocco) (interpretation from French): Having had the privilege of presiding over the closing meeting of this session, which has been marked by significant and encouraging progress, I should like to take this opportunity to stress the importance of the work which has been done this year by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, both in the preparation of the draft treaty prohibiting the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof (CCD/269/Rev.3), and in the thorough consideration of a number of interesting questions on our agenda. There can be no doubt that the session this year has been particularly rich and fruitful, because of the large number not only of the suggestions that have been moved, but also of the constructive proposals which have been submitted by various delegations.

110. Having said that, I am sure that I speak for all the members of the Committee when I express first of all our deep gratitude to our co-Chairmen, who by their competence, humanity and unremitting effort have enabled the Committee to accomplish fruitful and, in many respects, positive work.

111. I also think I shall be expressing the feelings of the Committee if I warmly thank Mr. Epstein, the Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General, who with competence and devotion has continued to give us his very useful assistance. My thanks go also to all the members of the Secretariat, including the interpreters and translators, who have admirably contributed to making our debates and our written and spoken words better understood. The attendants who have constantly cared for our well-being and the quiet of our meetings also deserve our gratitude.

112. I wish all members of the Committee the greatest success in the accomplishment of their tasks, and in conclusion express the wish that the results of this session may encourage us in our future work and help us to achieve further progress. I thank you — and say goodbye until the next session.

The Conference decided to issue the following communiqué:

"The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament today held its 494th plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the chairmanship of Mr. Al Arbi Khattabi, representative of Morocco.

"Statements were made by the representatives of India, Japan, Sweden, Mexico, Brazil, the United Kingdom, Yugoslavia, Ethiopia, Argentina, the United Arab Republic, Nigeria, Burma and the Soviet Union, by the Chairman, and by the representatives of Mongolia and the United States.

"The delegations of Hungary, Mongolia and Poland submitted a working document concerning the introduction of a safeguard clause -- CCD/285 -- to the draft convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons and on the destruction of such weapons (A/7655), presented by Mr. J. Winiewicz, Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Polish People's Republic, at the 464th plenary meeting of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD/315).

"The co-Chairmen submitted a draft report to the United Nations General Assembly and to the United Nations Disarmament Commission (CCD/316).

"After considering the draft report at an informal meeting, the Committee resumed its formal meeting and adopted its report to the United Nations General Assembly and the United Nations Disarmament Commission (CCD/317).

"The Conference will reconvene on a date to be fixed by the co-Chairmen after consultation with all the members of the Committee."

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.